



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/616,734

07/09/2003

Dhananjay V. Keskar

42P16142

2758

59796

7590

02/18/2009

INTEL CORPORATION

c/o CPA Global

P.O. BOX 52050

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

ALAM, FAYYAZ

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2618

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/18/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/616,734	Applicant(s) KESKAR ET AL.	
	Examiner FAYYAZ ALAM	Art Unit 2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 19-23 and 30-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 19-23 and 30-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/28/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 19-23, and 30-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Please see rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 19, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over **Hayduk (USPN 2003/0054833)** in view of **Aburai et al. (USPN 2002/0090953)**.

Consider **claim 1**, Hayduk discloses a method, comprising: establishing a connection between a wireless electronic device and one or more supervisory devices associated with an area of wireless coverage (see [0012-0014;0018;0025-0027;0037;0039]; figs. 1 and 4 and associated text); the wireless electronic device sending configuration information associated with the wireless electronic device to at least one of the one or more supervisory devices (see [0012-0014;0018;0025-

Art Unit: 2618

0027;0037;0039]; figs. 1 and 4 and associated text); at least one of the one or more supervisory devices sending information associated with the area of wireless coverage to the wireless electronic device (see [0012-0014;0018;0025-0027;0037;0039]; figs. 1 and 4 and associated text); and at least one of the supervisory devices determining which functions are available for use on the wireless device in the area of wireless coverage using the device configuration information and the information associated with the area of wireless coverage (see [0012-0014;0018;0025-0027;0037;0039]; figs. 1 and 4 and associated text).

However, Hayduk does not explicitly disclose based on the determination sending permission information for the operation of each function of the wireless electronic device within the area of wireless coverage.

In the related field of endeavor, Aburai discloses and based on the determination sending permission information for the operation of each function of the wireless electronic device within the area of wireless coverage (see figs. 1-4,6-8,10-12 and associated text).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hayduk with the teachings of Aburai in order to remotely control the features and functions of a mobile terminal in a given restricted geographic area.

Consider **claim 19**, Hayduk discloses a system comprising: a wireless electronic device, wherein the wireless electronic device comprises logic to: establish a connection between the wireless electronic device and at least one supervisory device associated

Art Unit: 2618

with an area of wireless coverage(see [0012-0014;0018;0025-0027;0037;0039]; figs. 1 and 4 and associated text); send device configuration information to the supervisory device(see [0012-0014;0018;0025-0027;0037;0039]; figs. 1 and 4 and associated text); and the supervisory device associated with the area of wireless coverage, comprising logic to: send information associated with the area of wireless coverage to the wireless electronic device(see [0012-0014;0018;0025-0027;0037;0039]; figs. 1 and 4 and associated text); and determine which functions are available for use on the wireless device in the area of wireless coverage using the device configuration information and the information associated with the area of wireless coverage(see [0012-0014;0018;0025-0027;0037;0039]; figs. 1 and 4 and associated text).

However, Hayduk does not explicitly disclose based on the determination sending permission information for the operation of each function of the wireless electronic device within the area of wireless coverage.

In the related field of endeavor, Aburai discloses and based on the determination sending permission information for the operation of each function of the wireless electronic device within the area of wireless coverage (see figs. 1-4,6-8,10-12 and associated text).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hayduk with the teachings of Aburai in order to remotely control the features and functions of a mobile terminal in a given restricted geographic area.

Consider **claim 30**, Hayduk discloses a supervisory device associated with an area of wireless coverage, comprising logic to: establish a connection with a wireless electronic device(see [0012-0014;0018;0025-0027;0037;0039]; figs. 1 and 4 and associated text); send information associated with the area of wireless coverage to the wireless electronic device(see [0012-0014;0018;0025-0027;0037;0039]; figs. 1 and 4 and associated text); receive device configuration information from the wireless electronic device regarding one or more functions associated with the wireless electronic device(see [0012-0014;0018;0025-0027;0037;0039]; figs. 1 and 4 and associated text); and determine which of the one or more functions are available for use on the wireless device in the area of wireless coverage(see [0012-0014;0018;0025-0027;0037;0039]; figs. 1 and 4 and associated text).

However, Hayduk does not explicitly disclose based on the determination sending permission information for the operation of each function of the wireless electronic device within the area of wireless coverage.

In the related field of endeavor, Aburai discloses and based on the determination sending permission information for the operation of each function of the wireless electronic device within the area of wireless coverage (see figs. 1-4,6-8,10-12 and associated text).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hayduk with the teachings of Aburai in order to remotely control the features and functions of a mobile terminal in a given restricted geographic area.

Claims 2-5, 20-23, and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over **Hayduk (USPN 2003/0054833)** in view of **Aburai et al. (USPN 2002/0090953)** and further in view of **Bates et al. (USPN 7,080,402)**.

Consider **claims 2, 20, and 31** as applied to respective claims, Hayduk as modified above does not explicitly disclose one or more priority levels associated with the area of wireless coverage and each function of the wireless device.

In the related field of endeavor, Bates et al. disclose priorities are assigned to each geographic region, as well as, to each application/function (read as one or more priority levels associated with the area of wireless coverage and each function of the wireless device) (see col. 3, lines 6 - 7; fig. 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hayduk as modified above with the teachings of Bates in order to further define the permissions and restrictions to mobile terminal features and functions and allow for robustness in access control.

Consider **claims 3, 21, and 32** as applied to respective claims, Hayduk as modified above does not explicitly disclose comparing the one or more priority levels associated with the area of wireless coverage to each wireless device function priority level; and setting permissions for the operation of each wireless device function based on the results of the comparison.

In the related field of endeavor, Bates et al. disclose that priorities are assigned to both the geographic region (read as area of wireless coverage) and electronic device (read as wireless electronic device) application/function and therefore the priorities may

Art Unit: 2618

be compared. In addition, once the comparison has taken place the electronic device would restrict access to an application/function in a given geographic location (read as comparing the one or more priority levels associated with the local area supervisory devices to each wireless device function priority level; and setting permissions for the operation of each wireless device function based on the results of the comparison) (see col. 3, lines 6 - 13; col. 7, lines 3 - 35; fig. 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hayduk as modified above with the teachings of Bates in order to further define the permissions and restrictions to mobile terminal features and functions and allow for robustness in access control.

Consider **claims 4, 22, and 33** as applied to respective claims, Hayduk as modified above discloses allowing the operation of functions that have a higher priority level than any supervisory device priority level; and disallowing the operation of functions that have a lower priority level than supervisory device priority level (see Aburai figs. 1--12 and associated text).

Consider **claims 5, 23, and 34** as applied to respective claims, Hayduk as modified above discloses the applications/functions are enabled by the user (read as settings most preferred by the user) and the function/application is allowed in the given geographic region (read as one or more supervisory devices) (see col. 8, lines 8 - 33).

Conclusion

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Fayyaz Alam whose telephone number is (571) 270-1102. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30am to 7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on (571) 272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Art Unit: 2618

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Fayyaz Alam

February 4, 2009

/Edward Urban/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618